

**REMARKS**

The drawings have been objected to by the Examiner because they fail to show the necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Figures 1-6 as described in the specification. As the Examiner will note, the textual material requested by the Examiner has been introduced into Figures 1 and 6 and accordingly it is believed that this objection has been eliminated.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chiba et al., U.S. Patent 6,651,120. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a method and apparatus for managing document data for eventual presentation to a user. In creating such a presentation, consideration is given to quantitative physical constraints associated with various stages of management, such as processing time, storage facility availability, capacity of a transfer facility, deadlines that may be set for certain results, quality of service, and the like, while at the same time, maintaining system consistency while meeting a single control button requirement.

In rejecting claim 1 as being anticipated by the Chiba et al. Patent, the Examiner, in paragraph 6 of the Office Action letter, specifically points out where certain method limitations of claim 1 can be found in the Chiba Patent. Thus, the Applicants wish to address each of the positions taken by the Examiner in paragraph 6 of the Office Action letter thereby hopefully pointing out to the Examiner his erroneous conclusions in this regard.

Thus, with respect to claim 1 of the present application, the Examiner points out that the expression "selectively converting the data in source representation to data in destination representation, while selectively storing in a data base managed data in an intermediate

representation” can be found in column 2, lines 40-47 and item 18 in Figure 10 of the Chiba et al. Patent. However, as discussed in the Chiba Patent, this expression in claim 1 is carried out under control of a user utmost, whereas in the present invention this feature is achieved automatically without user involvement.

With respect to the expression in claim 1, “first, assessing quantitative physical storage constraints associated with storing the managed data”, the Examiner argues that storage constraints will be assessed inherently while storing the managed data. Although it is understood that physical storage constraints inherently always play a role, if sufficient storage is not available, error conditions will occur. However, this is distinct over assessing quantitative physical storage constraints associated with storing the managed data. This is particularly true since, according to the present invention, the assessment is used in advance for making the dynamic tradeoff. The Chiba et al. Patent is silent with respect to this aspect of the present invention.

The Examiner further argues that the expression in claim 1 of the present application, “second, assessing quantitative physical converting constraints associated with converting the stored managed data from the source representation to the presentation”, can be found in column 2, lines 40-47 of the Chiba et al. Patent. In this regard however, it should be noted that the Chiba et al. Patent although disclosing examples of conversions, is silent with respect to assessing quantitative converting constraints.

With respect to the expression in claim 1, “executing the converting before said storing and/or after said storing, respectively, on a dynamic tradeoff basis between said first assessment

and said second assessment, while further considering one or more applicable source profiles and one or more applicable destination profiles”, the Examiner argues that this feature can be found in column 2, lines 55-60 of the Chiba et al. Patent. According to the present invention, a decision is made to convert before storage or to convert after storage. However, such a decision is nowhere addressed in the Chiba et al. Patent. It is also not identified as a problem for which the system of the Chiba et al. Patent provides a solution. In addition, the Chiba et al. Patent does not disclose in what way a decision is made, based on said dynamic tradeoff. The Chiba et al. Patent only discloses that a transfer of data may take place, but this is due to the fact that it is only at that time that the converter can be reached. This has nothing to do with storage, and even has nothing to do with making a dynamic tradeoff, since it only reflects a necessity, which is not negotiable.

Because of the distinctions between the present invention and the Chiba et al. Patent as pointed out hereinabove, it is believed that claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by or even rendered obvious over the teachings of the Chiba et al. Patent. Because of the distinctions between the present invention and the Chiba et al. Patent as pointed out hereinabove, it is believed that all of the remaining claims, that is, claims 2-17 which are dependent either directly or indirectly from claim 1, are also patentable over the Chiba et al. Patent for the same reasons. Similarly, management-system claims 18-20 which effectively mirror the method claims 1-17 are also considered to be patentable over the prior art relied upon by the Examiner for the same reasons as noted here and above.

To further distinguish the present invention from the teachings of the Chiba et al. Patent, one of the important features of the present invention to be considered, that is, making a dynamic tradeoff by the system which is executed by consulting a rule base as recited in claim 7 of the present application. The Examiner argues that this feature is disclosed in the Chiba et al. Patent, that is, item 19 of Figure 10. However, item 19 of Figure 10 is only described by its caption, "Operation Instructing Unit". On the other hand, the same item 19 in Figure 3 is described at column 7, lines 34-45. This paragraph states that "the operating instruction unit 19 instructs the image reading/displaying device 10 to transfer the specified image data, and also instructs the data converting unit 18 to convert the transferred data into the specified data form according to the specification". Where, in the same paragraph, it is stated: "when a user specifies image data... and also specifies a data form into which the transfer data is converted...". Thus, the Chiba et al. Patent discloses that the user instructs the machine to carry out conversions and the user specifies formats and transfers, where as in the present application, the conversion measures are carried out by the system automatically. Thus, it must be concluded that the Chiba et al. Patent does not disclose a rule base and does also not disclose that the machine makes this dynamic tradeoff.

Accordingly, it is believed that the Chiba et al. Patent does not overcome the novelty or the Applicants' inventive contribution defined by the claims of the present application.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all the claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Joseph A. Kolasch, Reg. No. 22463, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants hereby petition for an extension of three (1) month of October 29, 2006 in which to file a reply to the Office Action. The required fee of \$120.00 is enclosed herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph A. Kolasch

Registration No.: 22,463

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant